

OPINION 717

ARIZONA ELEGANS KENNICOTT, 1859 (REPTILIA): VALIDATED
UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby Ruled that the specific name *elegans* Kennicott, 1859, as published in the binomen *Arizona elegans*, is to be considered as not having been rejected as a secondary homonym in any paper published prior to the present Ruling.

(2) The generic name *Arizona* Kennicott, 1859 (gender : feminine), type-species, by monotypy, *Arizona elegans* Kennicott, 1859, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1652.

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *elegans* Shaw, 1802, as published in the binomen *Coluber elegans*, as defined by the lectotype designated by Williams & Smith, 1962 (Name No. 2046);
- (b) *elegans* Kennicott, 1859, as published in the binomen *Arizona elegans*, as defined by the lectotype designed by Blanchard, 1924 (type-species of *Arizona* Kennicott, 1859) (Name No. 2047);
- (c) *arenicola* Dixon, 1960, as published in the combination *Arizona elegans arenicola*, as defined by the lectotype designated by Williams & Smith, 1962 (Name No. 2048).

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1454)

The present case was first presented to the office of the Commission by Dr. Kenneth L. Williams and Prof. Hobart M. Smith in January 1962. The application was sent to the printer on 9 March 1962 and published on 10 September 1962 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **19** : 298–300. Public Notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Constitution Article 12b; *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **21** : 184) and to two herpetological serials. The further history of the case, together with an explanation of the Voting Paper, is set forth in the following Secretary's Note circulated to Commissioners with Voting Paper (64)3:

The application by Williams & Smith was published in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **19** : 298–300. Alternative proposals were put forward by Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **20** : 264–265) and were commented upon by Williams & Smith (*Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **20** : 265–266) who amended their original proposals and put forward a further alternative.

In Part 1 of the accompanying Voting Paper Commissioners are asked to vote either for or against the use of the plenary powers to set aside the operation of the Rules of secondary homonymy, so as to allow the continued use of the name *Arizona elegans* Kennicott, 1859.

In Part 2 of the Voting Paper Commissioners are asked to decide whether or not *Coluber arizonae* Boulenger, 1894, is to be recognized as a new species

name, rather than as a replacement name for *A. elegans*. An affirmative vote in Part 1 and a negative vote in Part 2 will have the consequence of placing *A. elegans* and *A. e. arenicola* on the Official List and rejecting *C. arizonae*.

In Part 3 of the Voting Paper, *those Commissioners who voted in the affirmative in Part 2*, are asked to vote either for or against the use of the plenary powers to suppress *arizonae* Boulenger, in order to place *Arizona elegans arenicola* Dixon, 1960, on the Official List of Specific Names. An affirmative vote in Part 2 and a negative vote in Part 3 will have the consequence of placing *A. elegans* and *C. arizonae* on the Official List and *A.e. arenicola* on the Official Index.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 27 April 1964 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (64)3 between the various alternative proposals in the present case. The issues presented in the three parts of this Voting Paper are explained in the Secretary's Note circulated with the Voting Paper (see above). At the close of the prescribed voting period on 27 July 1964 the state of the voting was as follows:

Part 1. Affirmative votes—twenty-six (26), received in the following order: China, Hering, Holthuis, Lemche, Mayr, Vokes, Simpson, Stoll, Uchida, Boschma, Tortonese, Riley, Miller, do Amaral, Obruchev, Evans, Bonnet, Kraus, Jaczewski, Borchsenius, Alvarado, Forest, Mertens, Binder, Brinck, Ride

Negative votes—none (0)

Part 2. Affirmative votes—six (6): China, Hering, Holthuis, Lemche, Bonnet, Jaczewski

Negative votes—twenty (20): Mayr, Vokes, Simpson, Stoll, Uchida, Boschma, Tortonese, Riley, Miller, do Amaral, Obruchev, Evans, Kraus, Borchsenius, Alvarado, Forest, Mertens, Binder, Brinck, Ride

Part 3. Affirmative votes—four (4): Hering, Lemche, Bonnet, Jaczewski

Negative votes—two (2): China, Holthuis

On Leave of Absence—one (1) Munroe

Voting Papers not returned—one (1); Hubbs

Commissioner Sabrosky declined to vote.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

arenicola, *Arizona elegans*, Dixon, 1960, *Southwestern Naturalist* 5 : 226
Arizona Kennicott, 1859, in Baird, *Rep. U.S. Mexican Boundary Survey* 2, Rept.: 18-19, pl. 13

elegans, *Coluber*, Shaw, 1802, *Gen. Zool.* 3 : 536

elegans, *Arizona*, Kennicott, 1859, in Baird, *Rep. U.S. Mexican Boundary Survey* 2, Rept.: 18-19, pl. 13

The following are the original references to the designation of lectotypes for the nominal species concerned in the present Ruling:

For *Arizona elegans* Kennicott, 1859 : Blanchard, 1924, *Occ. Papers Mus. Zool. U.Mich.* 150 : 4

For *Coluber elegans* Shaw, 1802 : Williams & Smith, 1962, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 19 : 300

For *Arizona elegans arenicola* Dixon, 1960 : Williams & Smith, 1962, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 19 : 300

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (64)3 were cast as set out above, that one of the alternative proposals contained in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 717.

W. E. CHINA
Acting Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

3 September 1964

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED REJECTION OF NINE SPECIFIC NAMES OF HOLOTHURIOIDEA. Z.N.(S.) 1587

(see volume 20, pages 383-387)

By E. Tortonese (*Museo Civico di Storia Naturale, Genova, Italy*)

In my opinion, the author has carefully analyzed the situation governing nine names of Holothurioidea and her action is clearly a good one for firmly establishing the use of the well-known names of the involved species. I find no reason for objection to the requested procedure; therefore I give my full support to Miss Clark's proposal.

May I add that in a group like Holothurioidea, where classification and nomenclature are still in an extremely unsatisfactory condition, any proposal for settling the correct use of the names is greatly welcomed.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF *DIPLECTRONA* WEST- WOOD, 1839. Z.N. (S.) 1580

(see volume 20, page 373)

By D. E. Kimmins (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

I would like to support the proposal, submitted by F. C. J. Fischer for the preservation of the generic name *Diplectrona* Westwood, 1839, as a valid name in Trichoptera. The name *Diplectrona* has been used both as a generic name for more than a century, and for a lesser time as the root of a suprageneric name in the Trichoptera. To allow it to be suppressed now in favour of *Aphelocheira* Stephens would cause unnecessary confusion in nomenclature and I am fully in favour of maintaining the current usage of the name *Diplectrona*.